

### Remarks

The Office Action dated April 7, 2006 has been reviewed, and the following remarks are made in response thereto. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims. Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are pending. Claims 1 and 42 have been amended. Written support for the claim amendments is found throughout the specification and in the original claims, thus Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

The previous amendment and response filed by Applicants on May 31, 2006 was purported to be non-compliant for failing to properly specify changes made to the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment and response indicates changes made to the specification in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121.

### Summary of the final Office Action

1. The previous amendment and response filed by Applicants on May 31, 2006 was purported by the Examiner to be non-compliant.
2. A new oath/declaration was requested.
3. Claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite because the abbreviations used in claims 1 and 42 are subject to more than one interpretation.
4. Claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as being unclear because it is uncertain if "GST" as used in claims 1 and 42 refers to a whole protein or a domain of a protein.

### Notice of Defective Oath/Declaration

The Examiner requested a new oath/declaration because the declaration allegedly contained non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's request.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the phone conversation held with Applicants' Agent on July 6, 2006. During this conversation, the Examiner agreed that the supplemental declaration submitted on June 24, 2004 corrected the deficiencies with respect to Andrew Sparks in the original declaration. Briefly, Applicants submitted that Andrew Sparks properly executed a supplemental declaration in which he was the sole signatory. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a)(2) deficiencies or inaccuracies relating to fewer than all the inventors may be corrected with a supplemental oath/declaration identifying

the inventive entity but signed only by the inventor(s) to whom the error or deficiency relates. Andrew Sparks properly executed a supplemental declaration, without any alterations, that was filed simultaneously with the original (allegedly defective) declaration on June 24, 2004. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the notice of defective oath/declaration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite because the abbreviated terms, in claims 1 and 42 are allegedly subject to more than one interpretation.

The Examiner alleges on page four (4) of the office action that the abbreviated terms, “GST, SH1, PH, PTB and LIM,” in claims 1 and 42 may be subject to more than one interpretation. For example, the Examiner contends that the abbreviated term “GST” could indicate glutathione S-transferase or genomic sequence tag. Claim 1 reads in part, “a domain of interest selected from the group consisting of GST, SH1, PH, PTB, LIM.” Applicants respectfully point out that the abbreviated terms “GST, SH1, PH, PTB and LIM” as used in combination with the preceding term “domain” would be well known and clearly defined to one of skill in the art.

However, without acquiescing to the merits of the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to clearly indicate the full-name for each abbreviated term. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 42 to specify that the term “GST” refers to Glutathione S-transferase, the term “SH1” refers to Src homology 1, the term “PH” refers to Pleckstrin homology and the term “PTB” refers to Phosphotyrosine binding. Additionally, Applicants have amended the specification to include the full-name for each abbreviated term in order to provide clear antecedent basis for the full-names used in the amended claims. While an Applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed, he or she should make appropriate amendment of the specification whenever this nomenclature is departed from by amendment of the claims so as to have clear support or antecedent basis in the specification for the new terms appearing in the claims (see MPEP 608.01(o)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants have amended the Specification to clearly indicate that the term “LIM” derives its abbreviation from the first letter of the three genes in which it was first discovered, the Lin-11, Isl-1 and Mec-3 genes. Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of the foregoing to the

Specification does not constitute new matter as one of skill in the art at the time of the present invention would categorically recognize that the abbreviated term "LIM" preceded by the term "domain" refers to the domain present in the Lin-11, Isl-1 and Mec-3 gene products. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 1, 42 and 103-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being unclear because "GST" as used in claims 1 and 42 may allegedly refer to either a whole protein or a domain of a protein.

Without acquiescing to the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 and 42 to specify that the claims are directed to a catalytic subunit of GST. Support for this amendment is located on page 32, lines 14-24 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. be reconsidered and withdrawn.


#### Conclusion

The foregoing amendments and remarks are being made to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. A favorable action is awaited. Should the Examiner find that an interview would be helpful to further prosecution of this application, they are invited to telephone the undersigned at their convenience.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: **July 7, 2006**  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
Customer No. **09629**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
202-739-3000

Respectfully submitted  
**Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher J. Betti, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 56,890